DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 403 SO 015 143

AUTHOR Federman, Joel
TITLE Toward a World Peace Movement.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the International Studies Association Convention (Mexico City, Mexico, April 9, 1983).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Disarmament; Fine Arts; *Global Approach; *International Organizations; Justice; Nuclear Warfare; *Peace; Political Attitudes; Political Socialization; School Role; *Social Action; Social Attitudes; Social Change
IDENTIFIERS *Anti Nuclear Movement; Freedom; Nonviolence

ABSTRACT

A course of direction is charted for the anti-nuclear movement. Concern over the growing nuclear arsenals has grown considerably over the last two years for several reasons, including the educational efforts of several anti-nuclear groups, and the publication of several books, such as Jonathan Schell's "The Fate of the Earth." Until now, the anti-nuclear movement has, for the most part, been a reaction to an increasing climate of fear. The participants in this movement need to inspire in people confidence to rise above the situation; they need to turn the movement into a force for positive change, into a movement for world peace. To do this, the movement would have to become a global movement--and there are many signs that it is emerging as such. The anti-nuclear movement must commit itself to a process that will bring civilization by degrees toward an ever-closer approximation of the ideal of peace. In the quest for peace, the art that must be practiced but that can never be perfected is nonviolence. The movement must, therefore, attempt to enhance the conditions under which nonviolence flourishes; it must call internationally for both justice and freedom. It must use education and the arts to encourage an understanding of peace. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED237403

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Federman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TOWARD A WORLD PEACE MOVEMENT

Joel Federman
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90089-0044

SO 015 143

A paper presented at the 1983 International Studies Association Convention, Mexico City, Mexico, April 9, 1983.

TOWARD A WORLD PEACE MOVEMENT

"Imagine all the people
living life in peace.
You may say that I'm a dreamer,
but I'm not the only one.
I hope someday you'll join us,
and the world will be as one." --John Lennon

The dreams of humanity can come true only if enough dreamers take to action when circumstances grant them propitious opportunities. The current moment may be an opportunity of this sort for the dream of peace, and should not be wasted. In our time, people are just beginning to become aware of the fact that humanity possesses the means of its own obliteration. Those means, the tapping of the basic force of the universe, have been in our possession in a concrete way since the construction at Los Alamos, New Mexico, of the first atomic bomb in the early months of 1945. In the last year, a political movement has blossomed out of a spreading recognition of the potential for devastation that the existence of such weapons makes real. Already, millions of people have demonstrated their concern in the streets of Paris, New York, Bonn, Tokyo and hundreds of other cities. Despite the movement's magnitude, however, its participants are unsure of its fundamental direction. While they have been enormously successful at spreading their recognition of the dimensions of the problem, they have not yet defined a solution of commensurate scope. As a result, there is a real danger that they might dissipate their energies by creating a climate of concern over an issue for which there is no apparent resolution, thereby generating a mass frustration which leads nowhere. If they are to avoid this fate, those in the movement must now begin to clarify its motivations, conceive its world-view, imagine its goals, establish its

agenda and develop its vision. Specifically, if this movement is to solve the problem it is seeking to address, it should shed its vague "anti-nuclear" definition and begin to take form as a movement for world peace. What was once only an ideal has now become also a necessity. In the future we have entered, as Martin Luther King so eloquently stated, "It is no longer the choice between violence and nonviolence. It is nonviolence or nonexistence."

From Fear to Confidence

If we are going to attempt to chart a course of direction for the anti-nuclear movement, it would be useful to examine the forces which have formed its present character. If we develop a clear understanding of its present character, we can begin to consider how that character might be altered to create a satisfying resolution of the nuclear dilemma.

Humanity has possessed the technological and political potential for nuclear warfare for several decades. Yet, until recently, with the brief exception of the "ban the bomb" movement of the 1950's, most people came to accept the existence of growing nuclear arsenals with a high degree of complacency. Only in the last two years have we seen the rapid growth of concern over the existence of these stockpiles. This increase in anxiety can be traced to several causes.

The first, and most important of these causes was the 1980 election of Ronald Reagan to the presidency of the United States. While an anti-nuclear movement was already brewing in Europe at that time, (due to the 1979 decision by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, (N.A.T.O.) to deploy cruise and Pershing II missiles on European soil), it was Reagan's election that spurred that movement to its current proportions and

spawned countless other anti-nuclear movements around the globe, including one in the United States. Ronald Reagan had campaigned for the presidency for many years with a foreign policy program that emphasized anti-communism and a military build-up. Once in office, he proposed the largest arms build-up in world history, with a projected cost of $1.5 trillion over a period of five years.[1] His appointees to high-ranking foreign policy positions began to talk openly about the "survivability" of nuclear wars. At the same time, bills were sent to Congress to expand civil defense programs and plan to increase the deployment of military technology in outer space was approved. As a result of these policies and polemics, many people perceived that the Reagan administration was increasing the likelihood of a nuclear war. Their unsurprising reaction was to begin to fear for their lives and to look for ways to express their concern.

A secondary, but important, source of stimilation for anti-nuclear activity has been the educational effort of several anti-nuclear groups, especially the Physicians for Social Responsibility, under the charismatic leadership of Helen Caldicott, its president. Caldicott argues that doctors have a professional responsibility to consider nuclear war as a medical issue as well as a political one, since doctors would presumably be called upon to treat the potential survivors of a nuclear exchange. If we assess the medical needs of a typical urban population following a nuclear attack, the prognosis is terrible. The numbers of those who would require immediate treatment would overwhelm the capacities of those medical facilities that survive the attack. Further, in an all-out nuclear exchange, there would be an impossibility of outside help because the locations from which such help might be expected would also be likely

targets for similar devastation. From this assessment, Caldicott concludes that, from a medical point of view, the only adequate treatment for a disease such as nuclear war is prevention, which requires the elimination of nuclear weapons. Thus, informing the public as to the consequences of nuclear war becomes the social responsibility of the physician. Caldicott and other physicians have spoken throughout the world on behalf of this argument, graphically depicting the specific consequences of a nuclear war for each city they visit.

Another aspect of anti-nuclear education efforts has been the publication of several books concerning the issue of nuclear war. Preeminent among them is Jonathan Schell's, The Fate of the Earth, a best-seller dubbed "the Bible for our time" by Caldicott.[2]

Schell's central argument is that we (humanity) live with "one foot in each of two worlds." The first "world," our political world, is structured as a system of sovereign nations, capable of engaging in war, which is seen as a function of their independence and sovereignty, a rational extention of legitimate political affairs, The second "world" in which we live consists of the current state of our scientific understanding of nature and the technology, specifically, the technology of nuclear warfare, that we have developed with that understanding.

Both of these worlds are of our own creation, and we exist in them. But, they are in contradiction. If we continue to organize planetary politics as a system of sovereign nation-states capable of resorting to war, we may destroy the entirety of the planet's biosphere: all existing life forms on the land, under the sea, and in the air. A large portion of The Fate of the Earth is devoted to an excruciatingly detailed account of how nuclear war might bring about such biospheric extinc-

tion, a story of a potential nuclear war which brings about instantaneous "zones of universal death" followed by the "sky of the whole earth" turning from blue to brown as the ecosystem collapses.[3] Schell lays out his compendium of evidence, adding that while current nuclear arsenals might not bring about complete annihilation. Insects and grass, less sensitive to radiation, might inherit the earth. Other species, including humans, may survive in mutated and cancer-ridden forms. Thus, we have entered into a "zone of uncertainty" concerning the fate of the earth:

> At just what point the species crossed, or will have crossed, the boundary between merely having the technical knowledge to destroy itself and actually having the arsenals at hand, ready to be used at any second, is not precisely knowable. But it is clear that at present, with some twenty thousand megatons of nuclear explosive power in existence, and with more being added every day, we have entered into the zone of uncertainty, which is to say the zone of risk of extinction.[4]

Entering this zone of uncertainty, Schell argues, reverses the traditional roles of "realists" and "utopians." A global system of conflict resolution which does away with the need for guns and bombs and armies appears to be the only realistic option available to a world in which any armed conflict between nations could escalate into a nuclear holocaust. Likewise, to argue for the continuation of a system of sovereign nations capable of armed conflicts when such conflicts can destroy the peoples of those nations and along with them any principle upon which their notion of sovereignty might be based seems a utopian position. It is a politics which regards the fundamental reality of the nuclear age.

If we are to be realists in the nuclear age, Schell states, we must recognize that we face a fundamental choice: extinction or a global

political revolution in which we "lay down our arms, relinquish sovereignty. and found a political system for the peaceful settlement of international disputes."[5]

While seemingly at cross-purposes, the Reagan administration, and the anti-nuclear educational groups and books have contributed together to a climate of fear that has resulted in producing the anti-nuclear movement. Hundreds of millions of people now have a clear understanding of what would likely happen to them if a nuclear war were to break out between the United States and the Soviet Union, and they believe that the probability of such an eventuality is high.

Until now, the anti-nuclear movement has, for the most part, been constituted as a reaction to this increasing climate of fear. Now that it has come into existence, it must decide on a direction of its own. For without a clear understanding of their ultimate goals, political movements are all too often led astray by the course of events in the stream of history they are seeking to alter. If it continues to generate fear, without also inspiring in people confidence that we have the ability to rise above the situation, it may end up only promoting despair, which could lead to a temporary paralysis of public will, during which our current planetary leaders, themselves benighted in vision, bring us evercloser to a moment of cataclysm. The participants in this movement, particularly those who speak and write on its behalf, need to develop a rationale which would turn the movement into a force for positive change. That is, they need to design a constructive alternative to the conditions they find themselves opposing. Without such an alternative, they are merely engaging in political vandalism. The anti-nuclear movement would best serve its purpose of ridding the world of

nuclear weapons if it became a thorough-going movement for world peace.

In considering a transformation of this sort, we might well utilize, with Schell, one of the most apt metaphors for the nuclear age, the "doomsday clock" of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Since 1947, the Bulletin has featured the face of a clock on its front cover, the hands of which are set (by the editors) closer or further from a "midnight" which represents nuclear obliteration. Schell imagines how such a clock might be turned further and further away from the moment of holocaust:

> If, by treaty, all nuclear warheads were removed from their launchers and stored somewhere else, and therefore could no longer descend on us at any moment without warning, the clock would show the amount of time that it would take to put them back on. If all the nuclear weapons in the world were destroyed, the clock would show the time that it would take to manufacture them again. If in addition confidence-inspiring political arrangements to prevent rearmament were put in place, the clock would show some estimate of the time that it might take for the arrangements to break down. . . But no generation would ever be justified in retiring the clock from use altogether, because, as far as we can tell, there will never again be a time when self-extinction is beyond the reach of our species.[6]

As we consider how we can beat a hasty backward retreat from the frightening face of universal death, we might benefit by turning around to gaze in the direction of the kind of world we can create in this process, a world in which humanity lives at a level of civilization closer to its potential moments of absolute harmony. Our current dilemma can give rise with new force to the hope of the ages. The nuclear peril may be the nightmare that wakens the people of the Earth to an awareness of the fundamental condition of their existence. That is, we may come to see that humanity is a family whose home is this planet, and that our destiny, if it is not robbed by our stupidity in the cradle, can be to

rise to ever-greater approximations of universal peace and love.

We need not think of ourselves as a warrior race, tamed only by the fear of our own destructive powers, reluctantly laying down our weapons for lack of choice. The resolution of the nuclear dilemma does not have to come about solely as the product of a kind of technological determinism. Rather, if we take the long view and recognize that, from the cosmic perspective, recorded human history, and even the human species itself, is a very recent event, we can view humanity as an infant species that has the potential to reach maturity and transcend forever the violent temper-tantrums that are its wars.

The Third Superpower

In becoming a movement for world peace, the anti-nuclear movement would have to undergo several transformations. It would have to become a global movement, both in its participant's political perspective and in its scope. Fortunately, at this point in history there are any number of signs which point toward a global world-view. As historian Henry Steele Commager points out, nationalism may be a transitional, rather than ultimate, stage in the evolution of political institutions:

> Just as we know, or should know, that none of our domestic problems can be solved within the artificial boundaries of the states, so none of our global problems can be solved within the largely artificial boundaries of nations--artificial not so much in the eyes of history as in the eyes of Nature . . . Every major problem that confronts us is global--energy, pollution, the destruction of the oceans and the seas, the erosion of agricultural and forest lands, the control of epidemics and of plant and animal diseases, famine in large parts of Asia and Africa and a population increase that promises to aggravate famine, inflation, international terrorism, nuclear pollution, and nuclear arms control. Not one of these can be solved within the limits of a single nation.[7]

There is one sign that stands out from all others as a graphic depiction of our planetary unity, a corrective lense for our myopic nationalistic political perspective. One glance at a photographic image of the Earth that has been captured from a point of extra-terrestrial vantage reveals beyond doubt the place of all people relative to each other: alone together on a blue green planet adrift in the midst of an infinite sea of space: one nation, one race, one people.

In fact, anti-nuclear movements all over the world are already developing a global perspective. There is an internationalist spirit spreading amidst many of the national movements in Europe, and their leading writers are beginning to articulate its content and expand its range. E. P. Thompson, a historian and member of the coordinating committee of END, a British based pan-European disarmament coalition, writes that:

> (S)omething remarkable is stirring in this continent today: movements which commenced in fear and which are now taking on the shape of hope; movements which cannot yet, with clarity, name their own demands. For the first time since the wartime Resistance there is a spirit abroad in Europe which carries a transcontinental aspiration. The other which menaces us is being redefined not as other nations, nor even as the other bloc, but as the forces leading both blocs to auto-destruction --not Russia or America but their military, ideological and security establishments and their ritual oppositions.[8]

Further, there are incipient indications that Western European movement activities have struck responsive chords and created further reverberations in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union. Mary Kaldor, of England's Labor Party and an important voice in the European movement, reports that:

> We have been amazed by the response we have had from Eastern Europe. We now have a very big and growing correspondence with people in Poland, with people in East Germany and with people in Hungary. Not only did the President of Rumania call for a nuclear-free Europe, Both East and West (including Western Russia), but one hundred thousand people marched in Rumania against both Soviet armaments and Western armaments.[9]

In East Germany, where residents can pick up West German television and therefore witness the burgeoning peace movement there for themselves, there exists the largest independent movement in the Eastern bloc. Earlier this year, in Dresden, they were able to muster a crowd of 5000 persons to attend an illegal candle-light peace forum.[10]

In the Pacific Region, several international conferences have been, held and a network has been formed among disarmament groups which span nearly the entirety of the region, including Hawaii, Japan, and New Zealand.[11]

Finally, while the governments of the world met in New York this June at the hugely unproductive United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmament, activist groups from 18 nations gathered a few miles away to do more than just talk disarmament. Titled the "International Action Conference for Nuclear and General Disarmament," the conference was initiated by the International Confederation for Disarmament and Peace, a coalition of nonaligned groups which had previously worked together during the Indochina war and more recently helped to establish European Nuclear Disarmament (E.N.D.), a transnational organization of European disarmament activists.[12]

The purpose of the conference, as stated in its brochure, was to "ensure that our (peace groups throughout the world) forces, separated as they are by distance, language and culture, understand how deeply

shared are our common goals and how urgent the need to maintain some network for contact and common strategy.[13]

One result of the conference was a "strategy consultation" document, which outlined some of the suggestions for overall peace movement strategy. These suggestions included: establishment and consolidation of nuclear free zones all over the world; support for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; opposition to foreign military bases with nuclear weapons; opposition to the sale of nuclear technology by any nation; attempts to shut down the nuclear fuel cycle from extraction to explosion either direct or via research and nuclear power programs; a demand for the establishment and acceptance by governments and the United Nations of a time frame for disarmament, lobbying of transnational corporations involved in the production of weapons and nuclear power; to seek stronger links between the international anti-nuclear and anti-war movements and the non-aligned countries.[14]

Clearly, the anti-nuclear movement is emerging as a global movement for world peace. As it internationalizes its scope and its perspective, it has moved one step foreward toward being a movement worthy of that name, not a movement for this or that truce, but for a disarmament that is <u>universal</u>, that ranges from handguns to nuclear warheads to the social order that creates the need for such weapons, a movement for peace among persons as well as nations. A genuine movement for world peace constitutes the seeding force of a new global political order, governed by a principle of self-determination down to the last person. If the anti-nuclear movement continues its transformation into a movement for world peace, it can come to be seen as a world government-in-exile. Or, as Eva Nordland, a Norwegian activist in the Women for Peace campaign,

believes it already is: "the third superpower".[15]

Critical Path

Now, we come to the practical question: How can those in the movement for world peace, personally as "pioneers of a warless world" (as Albert Einstein used to call draft resisters) and collectively as a world government-in-exile, seek to gain power and establish peace as the political order of the world?

In the consideration of this question, it might be useful to employ the conceptual metaphor of a "critical path," a notion popularized by Buckminster Fuller.[16] A critical path is the avenue toward a particular end or goal. At the moment persons or societies choose to accomplish a particular goal, many of the tasks necessary for the completion of that goal have already been accomplished. In actuality, we never consciously take the "first step" toward the accomplishment of our proverbial "thousand-mile journies." Our decision to accomplish a particular goal is based on a recognition of choices made available by previously accomplished tasks, which are already a part of the critical path to our goal at the time we decide to make it a goal. The following example, given by Fuller in his explanation of critical path accomplishments, should clarify this point:

> Greatly challenged by the Russians' initially most successful space-operating accomplishments, President John Kennedy authorized the funds for the Apollo Project...There were obvious first things first to be accomplished --second things before third things and 7308 things before 7309 things. Some were going to take longer than others....Fortunately, early humans, having no knowledge that what they were doing would someday lead to humans physically, safely visiting the Moon, had already accomplished one million of those essential tasks before President John Kennedy allocated the federal funds to accomplish the remaining one million.[17]

If we begin to think seriously about realizing the goal of a harmonious, peaceful humanity, it is helpful to think about the critical path toward that accomplishment: which critical path tasks have already been completed and which need yet to be done? The constitution of a planetary assembly and the construction of the United Nations building in New York can be taken into account. The invention of language symbols and the more recent development of inter-continental satellite telecommunications systems are also steps along this path. Many speculate, for example, that the movement to end the war in Vietnam was spurred into existence partly because television brought the carnage into the living-rooms of Americans, prodding their consciences into action.

As we try to imagine the critical path tasks that will bring us down the road toward a peaceful world, we should remember that the path toward peace, like that toward all other ideals is infinite, since absolute ideals are "necessarily transcendental and therefore unattainable."[18] Therefore, we are speaking in degrees. The goal of the peace movement is not, then, the establishment or institutionalization of peace but a committment to a process which will bring our collective enterprise, civilization, by degrees toward an ever-closer approximation of the ideal. While we will never achieve an absolute, permanent, realization of our goal, the struggle can bring us to a higher plane of relative imperfection.

In the practice of this process, the means we employ also fall under this principle that is, their practice is alein to our art-form; never perfect, but infinitely perfectible.[19] In the quest for peace, the art that we must practice but can never perfect is nonviolence.

Despite its prefix, nonviolence is a positive concept. As Mahatma Gandhi stated: "Ahisma (nonviolence) is not the crude thing it has been made to appear. Not to hurt any living thing is no doubt a part of ahisma. But it is its least expression. The principle of hisma (violence) is hurt by every evil thought, by undue haste, by lying, by hatred, by wishing ill to anybody.

"I accept the interpretation of Ahisma namely that it is not merely the negative state of harmlessness but it is a positive state of love of doing good even to the evil-doer."[20]

As we begin to think about how nonviolence might be practiced in the world today, we should recognize that nonviolent practice flourishes more readily in some environments than in others. As Hannah Arendt observed, "If Ghandi's enormously powerful and successful strategy of nonviolent resistance had met with a different enemy--Stalin's Russia, Hitler's Germany, even prewar Japan, instead of England--the outcome would not have been decolonization, but massacre and submission."[21] As a practical matter we cannot pursue nonviolence without also attempting to enhance the conditions under which it flourishes. For global society to be fertile ground for a plainting of the seeds of nonviolence, the aspiration for peace must be combined with an aspiration for its metaphysical identical twins: freedom and justice.[22]

Without an open channel for the free expression of opinions, ideas, tastes, and sensibilities, it is impossible to establish the cultural rapport necessary for the realization of political peace. Thus, freedom of expression within and between nations is a precondition of peace.

Injustice, in the form of gross inequalities of material wealth, creates social tensions out of which must spring an inevitable well of

violence. Such a condition of injustice is the pre-eminent feature of our global economy, a distribution system so absurd that while some people starve others have to watch their weight. We cannot expect a high degree of nonviolence from people who have been driven to desparation by extremes of economic deprivation, especially with growing awareness that such deprivation is due to maldistribution rather than a paucity of resources.

By standing for justice and freedom, the peace movement can, as a side-benefit of huge proportions, work to undermine the ideological structure of the Cold War. The United States and the Soviet Union have, justified their policies of foreign military intervention on the basis of their claim to be respectively the champion of political freedom (democracy) and distributive justice (socialism). Those in the United States who criticize its foreign and domestic policies that enforce economic injustice are often accused of being the enemies of political freedom, those in the Soviet Union who criticize Soviet policies which repress political expression are stifled as enemies of economic justice. However, justifications of these interventions obscure the reality that, in many instances, such as in Poland and in El Salvador they are intervening against indiginous movements for political change which are neither against freedom or justice but <u>for both</u>. All too often, these interventions account for nothing more than attempts by the United States and the Soviet Union to consolidate their global strategic interests, rather than acts in defense of absolute ideals.

If the peace movement calls internationally for both justice <u>and</u> freedom, it can undermine claims by the United States and the Soviet Union that such interventions are legitimate exercizes of power. The

emporers would be stripped of their clothes. By disentangling itself in this way from the cold war ideology and perspective, the peace movement clears the way for understanding of a new one. In Fact, this new perspective and this new order is already in the making, embodied in the idea of "nuclear free zones," such as the one called for by European Nuclear Disarmament (E.N.D.) in Europe. As E.P. Thompson explains:

> "There have been all the usual attempts --among the Soviet and NATO military -- to translate this movement into the habitual terms of the cold war... Yet the movement of Polish Solidarity is, in a critical sense, of the same kind as the movement in West Europe to resist nuclear rearmament. Both are movements of Europeans for autonomy -- away from cold-war cliency -- and movements, by Europeans, to resume a political space for themselves."
>
> "The Western European initiative for nuclear disarmament is not more "pro-Communist" than Polish Solidarity is "pro-capitalist." . . They offer a very difficult -- barely possible -- path forward, whose ultimate end would be, not only the dismantling of some nuclear weapons but the dismantling of the blocs which would throw them. A more limited success might offer, at the least, a nuclear-weapons-free space, in the heart of Europe, holding the superpowers apart -- a space of quiet within which alternatives could grow."[23]

Arenas of Action

As it moves down the critical path toward peace, the peace movement must attempt to exemplify and maximize nonviolence in every arena of life.

Below are some of the ways in which the peace movement can, and, in many cases, already is, working to bring nonviolence into the world.

a. Confronting the Military Establishment

One way to move toward peace is to disempower, delegitimate, and

inconvenience those institutions that make wars possible. One such institution is the military draft. In the United States, a recent reinstatement of military registration has met with widespread non-compliance. At least 675,000 young men have failed to register.[24]

In East Germany, where the military draft is compulsory, many have called for a "social peace service" as an alternative. The government has rejected the proposal, based on its "fundamental conviction" that military strength is the greatest safeguard to peace.[25] Despite this, the number seeking alternative service has climbed to more than 4,500, according to reports from West Berlin.[26]

Another method to inconvenience the war establishment was found by residents of Rocky Flats, Colorado, many of whom periodically gather to sit on the railroad tracks outside the Rocky Flats nuclear weapons plant, which is the "only facility that machines plutonium components for all United States fission weapons and thermonuclear fusion weapons," according to Daniel Ellsberg, of "Pentagon Papers" fame, who has joined in the protest.[27] Though the train always gets through to the plant, after the protesters are arrested and cleared from the tracks, it does not do so "invisibly" anymore, "not smoothly, on time, without effort or reflection from within the bureaucratic system; not without public question, comment, controversy, challenge. Not, anymore, with the presumed consent of all American citizens."[28]

A different variation of the same theme is practiced in the South Pacific, where "boat protests", in which floatillas of boats blocade the arrival of nuclear warships in their island ports.[29] The New Zealand Peace Squadron and Greenpeace International are but two of many groups who use boat protests as a means of demonstrating against atmospheric tests of nuclear weapons, dumping of nuclear wastes in the Pacific.[30]

b. Questioning Intervention

Though a recent poll shows that the United States population, by a 54 to 36 percent feels that its government should "stay completely out of the situation" in El Salvador, the Reagan administration continues to send military aid to the government there.[31] Further, recent Congressional investigations showed that 28 of the 38 U.S. "military advisers" in El Salvador have been receiving combat pay.[32]

In the United States, there is a growing opposition to the government's involvement. A coalition which includes church groups, trade unionists and university professors called the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (CISPES) was formed in late 1980 to coordinate this opposition.

c. Education and The Arts

In his Republic, Plato noted the fundamental interdependence between politics and culture: "When modes of music change, the fundamental laws of the State change with them".[34] By "music," he meant not just the melodies played by instruments and sung by voices in formalized song, but the whole of the cultural universe of a society. In every society, a process of enculturation of "socialization" occurs in which those entering that society learn its norms, values, precepts, mannerisms and tones of thought. These sensibilities, which make up the culture of the society, set limits on the range of political institutions in which the members of society can successfully participate and call their own. If the norms of the society encourage rugged individualism, for example, it may be difficult to enact governmental programs which involve income-sharing. Recognizing the power of culture

to set parameters on the possibilities for political change, Plato devoted much energy to describing the details of the educational system through which the youth of his Republic would have to pass as a process of socializaiton. Likewise, if we are going to consciously plan and execute the steps down the critical path toward universal peace, we must begin to re-design the curricula of academia and the emphasis of popular culture to help advance that goal. Taking up the metaphor of music, we might say that human social life has consisted of a 5000 year dissonant strain, longing for harmonic resolution. Those who have been given positions of cultural authority have a responsibility to encourage the writing of that refrain.

Some might argue that a proposal of this kind commits the double blasphemy of politicizing both education and the arts. To them we must reply that education and the arts are apolitical only to the smallest of minds. A comprehensive understanding of experience defies any clear divorce boundary drawn between the realm of the aesthetic and the rest of reality. Any learning about society is inherently political; all art touches the larger society. The educator and the artist cannot escape the realm of the political. Their only choice in this matter concerns the nature of their involvement. Even disinterest is a form of involvement -- an implicit support for the status quo ad infinitum.

Now, to recognize that education and the arts are interconnected with politics is not to argue that artists and academics should give themselves over to the service of politics as generic propogandists, shills for every process to control the arts are evident in many countries today. There is also much value in the notion of acadmia as an "ivory tower" in which academics can establish a critical distance

from which to view and judge the larger society. It is also true that -- while no one can be uninvolved in the political process -- many great contributions to our appreciation of the good, the true and the beautiful are the result of a conscious disinterest in politics on the part of certain individuals. What is being argued here is not that artists and academics become professional politicians, but only that they make an exception to the norm of disinterest for the cause of peace.

No great polemic need be made on behalf of the principle of peace as a sufficient cause for such an exception. Perhaps the most universal and noble dream of humanity, the merits of peace are obvious. If our rationale need be concrete, we need only pose the rhetorical question: Which part of society loses its funding resources with the least public protest when public energies become devoted to the cause of war? Then we may ponder the state of the education and the arts were we to free up the $500 billion per year and the human talents of 50 million people now consecrated to institutions of violence globally.[35] By promoting peace, artists and academics defend themselves as well.

If artists and academics choose to work for the accomplishment of universal peace, they must outline a clear agenda. Their task would be to facilitate an emerging cultural universe of harmonic discourse designed to complement the restructuring of political institutions that promote nonviolent conflict resolution. As such, they would be engaged on many fronts.

Academics could contribute critiques of the arguments used in the news media to justify and rationalize support for military conflicts of all kinds throughout the world. The logical and moral contradictions

and fallacies inherent in any argument on behalf of political domination by force should be relentlessly illuminated. Great pains should be taken to make sure that such critiques are not in any way selective in their choices of parties deemed admonishment. A lack of consistency in this regard would likely diminish the legitimacy of such critiques in general.

Those in the academy can also address themselves to their own institutions of cultural formation: schools, colleges and universities. If an institution of learning truly considers itself a facility for the development of reason, then it should keep in mind that reason is not merely a faculty to calculate means to pre-determined ends but also the power to determine those ends that guide our behavior. Faculty in all fields can aspire to inspire their students to deliberate seriously upon the raison d'etre of their proposed field of life-endeavor and consider how the product of their career might contribute to the realization of the higher ends of life, of which peace, justice and freedom are a number. If their biological parents have failed to teach them an appreciation for these ideals, the responsibility for this spiritual parentage falls more heavily on the academy.

More specifically, teachers and professors can work together to design interdisciplinary curricula for courses which encourage an understanding of peace. Since 1970, degree programs in peace studies have been established at 35 colleges and universities across the country. Over 100 institutions offer courses of this kind. In addition, a bill to establish a National Peace Academy as a counterpoint to our military academies, has been introduced in Congress with 53 Senators and 69 Representatives as co-sponsors. If established, an entire curricula

Will have to be designed for it. Whole courses can be designed to discuss the tradition of peace and pacifism in literature and philosophy. The subject matter for such courses lies in wait: from Isaiah and Jesus to Kant and Gandhi; from Schiller's "Ode to Joy" to John Lennon's Imagine." Those concerned with philosophy, literature and psychology can begin to offer courses concerning the sensibilities of peace. Are there differences, for example, in the logical structure or grammar between peaceful and violent discourse?

Further, academics should make sure that the research they conduct does not contribute to the technology of war. With this in mind, Tufts University recently became a "Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zone,"[36] Nuclear weapons research as well as university investments were declared banned.[37] If this were to happen at major universities as well as small liberal arts colleges, it would have a major impact on the military establishment.

Artists might try to inhibit the ways in which popular culture they create contributes to the mentality of war. In many ways, popular culture takes us down the critical path toward nuclear annihilation more readily than it aids the cause of peace. For instance, many studies have been undertaken recently to determine whether portrayals of interpersonal violence and sexual abuses in the mass media have an effect on the incidence of such activities in general. In the same vein, a good argument has been made that the popularization of space-war video games and movies sensitizes the populations of whole societies for high technology international warfare. Artists who are sensitized to the ideal of peace might want to limit their production of cultural artifacts of this type.

Writers, directors, actors, singers, poets, sculptors, and painters can create imaginative portrayals of the more subtle and relaxed forms of social intercourse that might evolve in a society devoid of the extremes of violence we know today, a society in which women can travel without fear of the night, and men can act as brothers without being thought weak. Rather than Western-movie versions of macho cowboy heroes, it is this form of theater which we need to project into the political realm. Though the production of morality plays of this type can be easily carried to an extreme, we are far from that extreme in the United States today. The Promethean task of delimiting and encouraging the ethos of peace would be much easier if we could see some concrete representations of that ethos in our theater. Artists can contribute to the politics of peace by becoming the avant garde of a cultural revolution toward gentler styles of social interaction.

On The Need For Vision

Ultimately, the success of all the aforementioned endeavors depends upon the courage of vision displayed by those who attempt them. Albert Einstein, whose vision brought us into the nuclear age, said of our dilemma: "(T)he unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and we thus drift toward unparalleled catastrophes.[38]

The words "modes of thinking" are crucial here. With them, Einstein was not crying for a new ideology of peace, a re-brainwashing of humanity to believe in non-violence as they now accept war as a "given" of life. Rather, he was calling for a greater intensity of sight and of feeling, a rational sensibility for which only peace is possible. For

one who knows that matter and energy are forms of each other, and that nothing is external to anything else, love is the natural law of the universe:

> "A human being is part of the whole, called by us the 'universe,' a part limited in time and space. He experiences himself, his thoughts and feelings, as something separate from the rest -- a kind of optical delusion of his consciousness. This delusion is a kind of prison for us, restricting us to our personal desires and to affection for a few persons nearest to us. Our task must be to free ourselves from this prison by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole nature in its beauty."[39]

There is a Proverb which states; "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Ours may be a time of too little vision, and the people may perish. Only time will tell whether humanity is childish enough to blow itself up. What matters between now and some future point of certainty about the fate of the earth is what we tell ourselves about our collective potential. If we limit our imaginations of the future to the boundaries of the past, we shall surely perish. If instead we envision our lives as but a moment in the slow ascent of humanity from its primordial depths to its celestial heights, and choose to make our infinite perfectibility our perpetual goal, we may yet earn an enduring place in the universal process we sometines call Creation.

Joel Federman

FOOTNOTES

		Page
1.	"Reagan's Arms Buildup", Newsweek, June 8, 1982 . .	28
2.	John Trinkel, "Taking a Serious Look At Nuclear War," The Guardian, May 12, 1982	1
3.	Jonathan Schell, The Fate of the Earth, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.	58 & 90
4.	Ibid	94
5.	Ibid	226
6.	Ibid	109
7.	Henry Steele Commager, "Outmoded Assumptions," Atlantic Monthly, March, 1982	22
8.	E.P. Thompson, "East, West -- Is There A Third Way: Breaking the Cold War Ice", The Nation, July 10-17, 1982	49
9.	Mary Kaldor, "The New Movement in Britain" Fellowship, January/February, 1982	6
10.	Bradley Graham, "Anti-nuclear Protest Surfaces in East Germany", Cleveland Plain Dealer, May 23, 1982	2AA
11.	Program, "Okinawa International Conference Against Military Bases," Naha, Okinawa, April 28-30, 1981	
12.	Brochure, "International Action Conference for Nuclear and General Disarmament", New York, U.S.A. June 7-11, 1982	
13.	Ibid	
14.	"Strategy Consultation Report," International Action Conference for Nuclear and General Disarmament, New York, U.S.A., June 7-11, 1982	
15.	Interview, Eva Nordland, University of California, Los Angeles, December 28, 1981	

Page

16. Cf. Buckminister Fuller, Critical Path, New York; St. Martin's Press, 1981

Fuller might not appreciate the use of the term critical path in the context of this essay. He believes that peace can be achieved only by a technological revolution which will provide material plenty for all, thus eliminating the material basis for war. Therefore: "All who are really dedicated to the earliest possible attainment of economic and physical success for all humanity -- and thereby realistically to eliminate war -- will have to shift their efforts from the political arena to participation in the design revolution." 237

While it is true that technological super-efficiency would make the accomplishment of world peace much easier, the mode in which technology is used depends upon the nature of the given political order. As a planet, we currently have a food calorie-yield more than adequate to feed everyone on the planet, yet we do not do so.

Further, the recent successful attempt by the United Technologies Corporation to block the United States' signature to United Nations-negotiated treaty which would guarantee that the natural resources of outer space become the common heritage of humanity rather than the private property of some group suggests that technological virtuosity and human virtuosity do not necessarily go hand in hand. . . . . .

17. Ibid xviii

18. Raghavan Iyer, Parapolitics: Toward the City of Man, New York: Oxford University Press,1979. 22

19. Cf. Ibid, Passim.

20. Mahatma Gandhi, quoted in Joan V. Bondurant, Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971. 24

21. Hannah Arendt, On Violence, New York: Harcourt Brace and World, Inc. 1969. 52-56

22 That the case for the theoretical or metaphysical indivisibility of these ideals is impossible to explicate in the form of argument was best stated

26.

by Plato in his "Seventh Letter": "No treatise by me concerning (absolute ideals) exists or ever will exist. It is not something that can be put into words like other branches of learning; only after long partnership in a common life devoted to this very thing does truth flash upon the soul, like a flame kindled by a leaping spark, and once it is born there it nourishes itself thereafter . . . That is why any serious student of serious realities will shrink from making truth the helpless object of men's ill-will by committing it to writing." Cf. Plato, Phaedrus and The Seventh and Eighth Letters, New York; Penguin Books, 1973 136-140

23. E.P. Thompson, "A Letter to America," The Nation January 24, 1981. 92

24. "Draft Law's Teeth May Be Pulled," The Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 28, 1982 1

25. "East German's Dispute Draft", Los Angeles Times, November 23, 1981 1

26. Ibid. 1

27. Daniel Ellsberg, "Direct Action for Disarmament," New Age, May, 1980 26

28. Ibid 27

29. Peter Jones, "Pacific Hopes for the Pacific Ocean", IFOR (International Fellowship of Reconciliation) Report, March, 1982 5

30. Ibid 4

31. "A Newsweek Poll: "Stay Out", Newsweek, March 1, 1981 19

32. "Advisers Draw Combat Pay", Cleveland Plain Dealer, July 30, 1982 . . . . . 6A

33. Brochure: "U.S. Committee in Solidarity With The People of El Salvador (CISPES)", National Office, P.O. Box 12056, Washington,D.C.20005 . . .

34. Plato, The Republic, (Jowett). 115

35. United Nations Centre for Disarmament, Disarmament Fact Sheet No. 21." . . . . .

Page

36. Scot Harrison, "ON Militarism at Tufts", The TPAC Participant, May, 1982 4

37. Ibid 4

38. Albert Einstein, quoted in Jonathan Schell, The Fate of The Earth, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1982 188

39. Albert Einstein, quoted in Michael N. Nagler, "Peace as a paradigm shift", The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, December, 1981 52

38.